R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—20 12 13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1893-4
191.
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 93

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Passing orders on the alienation of certain lands belonging to the Sri Champaka Dharmaswamy temple at Bannerighatta in Anekal Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Mrs. 170-36 1-2

4-3-87

[illegible]

Mundidroog Dy

Comrs office

Bangalore 6th February 79

No 1244
/ Pro

Memorandum

The Dy Comrs docket No 1147 of the 29th ultimo reporting on the lands attached to the Banaiv ghatta Temple in the Anekal Taluk.

From the above report it would appear, tho this was not explained previously by the Dy Comr in his Pet No 766 of the 28th Novr last, that the lands in question were virtually Govt lands held by some order of a former date (which has no stability)

2 If under the circumstances of the pattas being in the name of the temple and not of the individual occupants the temple authorities which to contest the

the right of any auction purchaser to cultivate the land purchased, they can do so in the proper Court. The case is not one in which Govt. can take the initiative

3 The vernacular papers are herewith returned.

(Signed) T. G. Clarke
Offg Commr.

Copy

ಮುನಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು

ಗುಜ್ಜಿರಾಮನವರು

ನರಸಿಂಹರಾಜು

ರಾಮಿರಾಜು

ಕಾಮಶೆಟ್ಟಿರಾಜು

ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟಪ್ಪಮಿರುಜು

ಮುನಿಗದಿರಾಜು

No 2162

ముని యేలినవారు

సర్వసుఖము
రాయునిరుజవు
యంగవరదాశిరుజవు
యుగాశిరుజవు

No. 595

Mysore Dewan's Office,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 2182, dated October 1885 received at the Dewan's Office from Muniappa and others of Baneegatta, Anekal Taluq, is forwarded, ~~together with its~~ enclosures, to the Dy. Commr Bangalore District for report

BANGALORE,

9 Dec 1885.

By Order,

Draft

Secretary.

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—7-9-85.—2,000.

Grantha Sanchi No. 963 9/11

(General Serial No. 29.) 7114.

1885-86

From The Deputy Commissioner.
Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 7th January 1886.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & 2

General No.

No. 963

Reports on petitions
from Muniappa and others
of Banerghatta Amrutal Taluk

Rejection with Rud
11-1-86
noted

Ubly.
Read my remarks in pink
and please get all the
enforce.
12/3

Lay Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District
Dated 7th January/86

?
No. 963.

To

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Sir,

In returning the enclosure received with your official Memo No. 595 dated 9th Ultmo, I have the honor to state that the marginally noted 3 villages of the Anekal Taluk were originally held by the Temple of Champakadhamaswamy of Bannerghatta village on Surrvamanya Tenures - but in the year 1784-85, they were resumed and the lands that were in the enjoyment of the Service holders were Conferred to them on Kandayam and Pattas were made out in the year [illegible]

1. Sampigahalli.
2. Kanivoppanhalli
3. Kanivenkatanhalli.

Why?

Where Maps?

1835-36

2 As some of the Servants alien- Where? (d)
ated these lands and neglected
the Service due to the Temple, the
Pattahs are reported to have been
made out in the year Dhatu 1676-77.
in the name of both the Temple
and the person rendering service.

If Grants are
duly executed
Why did service
fall into neglect?
This paragraph
is inconsistent
with the records of the
1784/85 & 1835

3. Some of these Servants petitioned
to have the Pattahs made out in
their names, as they pay full assess-
ment on these lands; but at pre-
sent the Pattahs being in the name
of the Temple and the petitioners
orders were passed declining to
disturb existing arrangements till the
Survey Settlement.

very reasonable
request.

Can not [illegible]
to be carried out

4. The record is herewith for-
warded for perusal and return.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.
A Macaulay
Actg Sub Commissioner

Draft

(General Serial No. 31.)

188

From

To The Deputy Comm^r of Bangalore

Dated 16/3/86

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 7048

Cole No. ~~D 86~~ 180 Revenue

Your letter No: 963 of 7th January 1886.

With reference to the above, I have the honor to request information on the following points:—

(a) In whose name were the villages of Sampigehalli, Karenpalya and Kempanaikenhalli entered in the accounts when they were originally held by the temple of Channakeshavaswami of Ramenaghatta in Sarvamanya Kanive.

(b) Why were they resumed in 1784-85?

(c) In whose name

1835-36

2. As some of the Servants alien- ated these lands and neglected the Service due to the Temple, the Pattahs are reported to have been made out in the year Dhatu 1876-77 in the name of both the Temple and the person rendering service.

Where? (d.)

Is Carte-ke Kalkaraval? Why the service lapsed? This paragraph is inconsistent with Paragraphs 1 & 3 of 1784/85 & 1835/36

3. Some of these Servants petitioned to have the Pattahs made out in their names, as they pay full assessment on these lands, but at present the Pattahs being in the name of the Temple and the petitioners, orders were passed declining to disturb existing arrangements till the Survey Settlement.

very reasonable request.

Is it [illegible] to be recovered?

4. The record is herewith forwarded for perusal and return.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.
A Macaulay
Mad. Dy Commissioner

Draft

(General Serial No. 31.)

188

From

To The Deputy Comm^r of Bangalore

Dated 16/3/86

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 7048

Cclr No. ~~A 86~~ 180

Your letter No: 9637 dt. 7th January 1886.

With reference to the above, I have the honor to request information on the following points:—

(a) In whose names were the villages of Sampigehalli, Karekapalli and Kempanaikenhalli entered in the accounts when they were originally held by the temple of Channakeshavaswami of Ramanaghatta in Surva-maniya Kshetra?

(b) Why were they resumed in 1784-85?

(c) In whose names

were the D-attaks made out in the year 1835-36?

(d) When did the Servants alienate the lands?

(e) If lands are fully assessed, why should service be rendered? Para: 2 of the above letter is inconsistent with proceedings of 1784/85 and 1835/36.

(f) On what grounds and on whose orders were the Pattahs of the lands made out in the name of the temple & the Petitioners?

Yrs

Asst: Secretary

(General Serial No. 31.)

188

Vernacular papers Sm.

Office No. 963 dated

From

may be returned

To The Deputy Com[illegible]
Bangalore

Dated 30/3/86

Despatched —

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 7498
No. 471

Ack. 5th April 1886

Dy 18th Do

His Lo: 1219 of 22d
Instant, requesting
the return of vernacular
papers submitted
with his Lo
963 of 7th January last.

Returned the
Vernacular papers
as requested

Asst Secretary

(General Serial No. 29.)

1886/87

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore District.

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 18th January 1887

Despatched 20th January 1887

Received

Enclosures No. 1 to 2

General No. D No. 283. } 1886-87

Has the honor to forward information called for on certain points in connection with petition from Ramiappa & others of Bommanahalli, Anekal

Dy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District
Dated 18th January 18

D. No. 783.
Encls 1 (pl)

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 7098/180 of 16th March 1886, I have the honor to submit answers to the corresponding questions asked in the above.

(a) There are no records in the Taluk to shew in whose name the villages of Sampigehalli, Kempanaikenhalli and Kariappanhalli were entered in the accounts when they were originally held by the temple of Champakadhamaswami of Bannerghatta village, Anekal Taluk; but from the accompanying Ayakat Patti (No. 1 it appears that

Jasdik of Kanteran Pagodahs 4/3
and fanams 2/2 was originally
enjoyed by the temple for which
the marginally noted villages were *
granted on Sarvamanya tenure —
From the above it is presumed
that they were originally entered
in the name of the temple only.
(b) It cannot now be ascertained
under what circumstances the
villages were resumed in 1784—85
and there are no other records than
the mere statement of the old Shan-
-bhogue marked A to throw any
light on this point.
(c) It cannot be now ascertained
in whose names the pattas were made
out in 1835-36, Prabhava.
(d) In 1870 Kollear Venkataramana
and others mortgaged their lands to
one Kanchi Munisami Moodliar
some of which were sold by the Civil
Court in 1871, and 1877 to Narasimha

* Kasba Bannery &
Kempanaikanalli
Kariappanahalli
Sampegehalli
Varadahalli
Chakkanahalli
(a portion)

and Munisami Moodliar who are now in possession of them. Another land was also sold by the Revenue authorities for arrears of Kandayam due by the land holder, a Sweeper of the temple. The total extent of land so alienated is K. C. P. 2-2-13/4 assessed at Rs. 38/4/.

(e) As these lands were lightly assessed in consideration of their being held by the Servicedars of the temple, when the villages were resumed by Government and as they receive a small monthly allowance from the temple in addition to the above lands they are compelled to render the service required of them to the temple.

(f) As the office holders did not perform their service due to the temple properly and alienated some of the lands, the Jamabundi Officer in 1877, Mr. W Portens

the Pattas to be made out in the
name of the temple and these
three holders.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant.

T. H. Hendley
for Dy Commissioner.
Esq

Memo.

Correspondence ending with the Bangalore deputy Commissioner's N 783 of the 18th January 1887.

Muneappa
Kunigal Ramiah
Gulé Rama
Ramee
Narasee
Rama
Venkatadasi
Muniga

In their petitions to this Office addressed on September and october last Maddale Muniappa and others residing at Bannerughatta yegane Hobli Anekal Taluq, pray that the joint pattas of their lands issued in their names as well as in the name of ~~the~~ the temple of Sree Champaka Dhama Swamy in that Village may be ordered to be confined to their names the name of the temple being excluded.

2 The facts of the case are as detailed below

Bannerughatta
Kariappanahally
Sampigehalli
Kempenayakanahalli
Varadahalli

The temple of Sree Champaka Dhama Swamy at Bannerughatta originally held the nearly alienated Villages as Sarvamanium besides a wet land measuring 5 khandees near Chikkanahalli in the present Kachanahalli Taluq a quarter of a seer of oil from every oil mill in Bangalore

Some grain termed "Kalu Bhatha" from the lands under the jeganis tank. It cannot never be ascertained how these items of inam dea were first granted to the temple. The pendebare of the temple when it enjoyed these Inams amounted to 413 pagodas - 2 fanams and 8 Visas as per marginal details.

4 In 1784 A.D. during the Administration of Tippoo Sultan these Inams were resumed: the reason for this is not apparent. From this date up to 1800 A.D. when a money grant of 120 pagodas was authorized to the Temple by Dewan Purniah it is not known whether the temple was in receipt of any allowance for its Expenses.

5 After resumption, the marginally noted villages were leased out first to one Amara Sing for three years. This individual having demanded assessment for waste lands belonging to temple servants some of these left their villages and

P. I. V

+	Padetharu deepāradhana	166-6-8
	Talabdars.	240-9-0
	Sadilwar -	5-7-0
		413-2-8

+ Bammeraghatta
Kempunayakanhalli
Sampegehalli
Varadahalli
Kari-panhalli

		P.
*	1784/85 Krodhi	410
	1785/6 Viswavasu	420
	1786/87 Parābhava	430

and he was not able to satisfy the Govt. demand The Bangalore Ruling authorities in 1786-87 cancelled his contract and revised and slightly reduced the assessment on the lands in the villages including those of the temple servants and leased them out again to another individual by name Venkata Rao for three years from 1786/87 for 280 pagodas in the first year, 320 in the second and 360 in the third. In 1789/90, the contract was given to one Soobbiah. The revn of the villages which had risen to 380 pagodas in 1790-91 fell to 200 pagodas in 1798/99 The reason for this decrease is not apparent. In 1799/1800, a money grant of 120 pagodas was sanctioned to the temple by Dewan Purnaiah. In 1811/12 the late Maha Raja on the occasion of his visit to the temple raised the grant to 170 pagodas directing the Amildar to execute the repair

	P.
† Padthora seeparadhane	70
Talabdars †	50
Rathothsava	50
Total	120

⊕ Talabdars	82	Pagodas
Padthora	47	"
Miscellaneous	6	"
	35	"
Total	170	

needed to the temple at the cost of the Govt.

6 During the reduction of the Jasdeik of all the temples in the Province towards the latter part of the late Maha Rajah's Administration the Jasdeik of the temple in question was reduced to 90 pagodas, the amount at which it now stands. The temple also continues to enjoy a small Inam with a beriz of Rs 2-14-8 termed Cheekappaiahna ~~Tota~~ Thota in the village of Bannerughatta. It would appear to be usual to utilize dried trees in the Thop for the purposes of the temple.

7 Previous to 1834 the date of the appointment of Sepoys of Divisions, there was no practice of issuing Receipts or Pattahs for ordinary Cundayam lands except under special circumstances. The practice was soon afterwards established. In the case of the lands held by the temple servants, it cannot be ascertained what pattas were originally issued

Late Division Sepoys Circular order No 38 dd 3/11/34 (Vide the papers 2nd Subd)

to them. Since 1873, when the Survey forms were introduced ever into the unsurveyed Saluegs Receipt Books are being distributed among Ryots instead of Pattas.

8 In 1870-71, the land of one Venkata Ramana, a Servant of the temple was sold for a Cowl decree. This does not appear to have been brought to the notice of the Survey Office.

† Amils were 846 dd 30/10/76.

9 In 1874, the Amildar of Amkai observed that the Servants of the temple were in attendance to their work: he Summoned them and took a Muchelika from them for the due performance of their work. The Muchelika Seigned by the †marginally named individuals runs as follows:-

Archak Varadachary
Parapatyagar Venkat Ramiah
Tigolana Venkat Ramana
Gulé Ramana Venkat Ramana
Muniga
Narasee
Ramee
Naga Sarada Venkat Ramana
Sruthi yerra.
Dolee Penna
Dharana Vedega
Sweeper Muniga

(Copy of the Muchelika is filed with the Ver. Pro dated herewith.

"Often and often when it was complained that we were not regular in the performance of our services in the temple of ~~Sree~~ Chempaka Dhanna Swamy, we agreed before the Sirkar to attend properly to our services. The Parapatya-gar now complacies of our failure to do so [illegible]

to be excused for all our faults. We will hereafter attend timely to our services in the temple without giving room for any complaints. In case of our failure to do so, we will not object to our Patta lands, wet and dry, which we hold for service in the temple or houses and temple allowances being all resumed by Govt and others appointed in our places".

10 In consequence of some pecuniary transaction between the Parapatyagar and one Muniswami Moodaly of Anekal, the latter obtained a decree over the former and his heirs in the Court of the Munsiff Bangalore and procured an attachment of their lands: the representation made to the Court by the Amildar of Anekal that these were lands held for service in the temple was of no avail. The Amildar, therefore, on his urgee to the Muzrey Officer No 844 d 30th Oct 1876 represented that if the lands of the temple

servants

Talabdars	Allowances R. A. P.
Archaka	0 – 7 – 0
Parapatyagar	1 – 2 – 10
Shanbog	0 – 5 – 3
Panicharek	7 – 0
Churiekê	0 – 2 – 11
Swayampaki	0 – 1 – 5
Sahasra Nama	0 – 6 – 5
Vooparcetha Achar	0 – 2 – 4
Golla	0 – 5 – 3
Kolkar	0 – 5 – 3
Howerman	0 – 5 – 10
Sweeper	0 – 4 – 8
Mashaleh	0 – 2 – 11
Thaphê	0 – 10 – 2
Maddala	0 – 4 – 8
Kumbharthi	0 – 4 – 8
Nagasara	0 – 6 – 8
Kuthi	0 – 4 – 8
Dola	0 – 4 – 8
Dhavane	0 – 3 – 9
Dhobi	0 – 0 – 7
Total	7 – 2 – 11

Lands Statement to be with the Mem. papers

servants were held liable for Civil Decrees, it would be impossible to procure Servants for the small allowances offered by the temple, that it was necessary to assert the right of the temple for the lands and in this view recommended that the lands be registered in the name of the temple, the name of the Servant paying Condagem for each land being also mentioned in the Pattas for the same. After some correspondence, the Revenue officer said that in the absence of previous references he could not order the registry of the Pattas in the name of the temple and directed that the matter should be brought to the special notice of the Sub-Division officer and his orders thereon carried out.

11 Accordingly during the Jamabandy of the year Shalivahana 1876-77, the Amildar laid the matter before the Jamabandy Officer and represented that the Village of Bannerughatta had been formerly enjoyed as Sarwa manya by the temple of Chenpaka Dhama Swamy

afterwards resumed by
The lands in the
village which had
granted by the temple
its Servants When the
village was in its holding
were continued after the
resumption of the village
to the same Servants on
condition besides small
allowances in money
on condition of their
performing their usual
Services in the temple
This arrangement
generally continued.
Some of their lands
were subsequently
sold for civil debts and
Revenue arrears. With
the small allowances
granted by the Govt, the
temple Servants found
it impossible to maintain
themselves and began
to shirk work in the
temple. To entertain
others in their places
was impossible inasmuch
as their allowances were
too small to attract
any body for their
work. Service in the
temple was entirely
dependent on the lands
allowed to the servants
and the right of these
lands belonged to
the temple If these
lands

lands were allowed to
remain in the names
of the Servants, they
alienate them and so
in the temple would
suffer. Under these
circumstances the
Huzur recommended
that joint Pattas of the
lands be made out
in the names of the
temple and its Servants
specifying in the Pattas
the Services for which
they were held by the
Servants. The recommendation
was approved by the Jamabandy officer on 31st March
1877. The Pattas were
accordingly modified

12. In 1877-78, the land of
the sweeper in the temple
assessed at Rs 8-12-5 was sold
for arrears of revenue and
the said Muniswamy Mudaly
purchased it and Mr Syed
Nasurreddien ordered Patta
for it to be issued in his
name. This individual
also bought the lands of the
Parapatyagar for the decree
he held against him as
above stated and applied
to the Revenue Authorities
for the Pattas of these being
transferred to him. After
some correspondence on
the Subject, the Nandidroog
Division Commissioner
in his memo No. 1244/1012 dd 6/2/1879

remarked that if under
circumstance of the
villas being in the name
the Temple and not of
e individual occupants,
he temple authorities
ished to contest the right
any auction purchaser
cultivate the land
purchased they might do so
in the proper court and
that the case was not one in
which the Govt could take
the initiative.

13 Meneswamy Mudaliar
refused to render
himself liable to the
Service required of the
Parapatigagar whose lands
he had purchased. He
withheld payment of
Condagem on the lands in
the absence of Patta for them
The Sub Division Officer
therefore directed, in his
order No 95 D 4 June 1879
that the lands may be
registered in his name
subject to the right, title
and conditions under
which they had been held
by the Parapatigagar

14. While one Hoovina
Ramaswamy applied in
1883 for permission to cut
some trees on his
land, some temple
servants objected. Thes

individual

* Mahazar by the Villagers of Bangerghatta 19/2/85

undervedual is said to have Substituted one Ramiah to do hes work of Supplying flowers to the temple. Ramiah enjoyed Ramaswamy's land for two years paying the assessment thereon through him; afterwards Ramaswamy interfered with its produce. this was complained against. Maddale Muniah neglected his service in the temple and refused to give up his land or to employ a substitute for him for the remuneration payable by the temple. Several of the temple Servants - except the Archak, the Parapatyegar and a few others - complained to the Dy Commr against the joint Pattas for their lands and solicited that the Pattas may be ordered to be issued Exclusively in their names. The Dy Commr. declined to interfere with the Existing Pattas till the Survey Settlement

* 25/9/85.

Grounds of the present [illegible]

15 The Petitioners now represent to this Office that the lands were enjoyed in succession

by their ancestors on augment of the assessment levied by them to Govt.

Pattas being in their names, that, in the year whether, without their Razeenama, the Pattas were made out in the name of the temple of Sri Shenpaka Dhama Swami and that this has seriously interfered with their hereditary rights to the lands.

16. In reply to the questions put in this Office No 7098/180 dt 16th March 1886, the Dy Comr Bangalore, in his letter No 783 dt 18th January last, remarks that the ~~xxxxx~~ Villages named in para 3 above were originally entered in the name of the temple; it cannot be ascertained under what circumstances the Villages were resumed in 1784/85 and in whose names the Pattas were made out in 1835-36; the alienation of their lands by the temple Servants was made since 1870: as these lands were ~~lightly~~ assessed in consideration of their being held by the Servicedars of the temple, when the Villages were resumed by the Govt and

and as they receive a small monthly allowance from the temple in addition to the above lands, they are compelled to render the service required of them to the temple. The Dy Commr. adds that as the Office-holders did not perform their service duly to the temple properly and alienated some of the lands, the Jamabandy Officer in 1877, Mr W Portous ordered the Pattas to be made out in the names of the temple and these Office-holders.

17 The papers now submitted do not contain any information as regards the lands of the temple servants in the Villages other than Bannerghatta alluded to in para 3 above

18 As regards the temple referred to, the Inam register is said to mention that the Govt grant to it is Rs 260 of which Rs 86-3- are spent on account of Talabdars.

19 The Survey of the Anekal Taluq is now almost over the Settlement is about to be given. It is very probable.

Survey Settlement. the
sessment on the lands
question may be
reased.

20 The temple Servants
have been holding the
nds referred to on a
oneurat reduced rate
base see para 5 above The
ry Commr observes that
es reduction is due
the consideration that
rvice is required of them
the temple The Service
lders themselves have
ated in their Memoheleka
referred to in para 9 that
n case of their failure to
ttend to their Service
the temple their lands
nd houses &c may be
resumed The lands
ay therefore be regarded
as Service lands of the
Temple and as such
their recent alienatio
cannot be upheld
and may be cancelled
under ~~orders~~ the Standing
orders on the Subject
printed at pages 79—90
of the new Edition of the
Revenue Manual. ~~The~~
~~receipt of Attendants to~~
~~the lands should therefore~~
~~require to be closely~~
~~supervised; especially as~~
~~the present money~~
Under these circumstances
the temple at present

Stands

+ Pattas for
The lands have been
made out in the names
of the Temple and its
Service holders

Stands in need of the
intervention of the
for its protection and
for the arrangements
necessary for the due
performance of its servi
by the temple servants
Submitted for Orders.

B.R

Lord Trevethin.

If the land was slightly
assessed on the ground
that the holders were temple
servants, the Court ought
not to have done the last
for its assessment: the land
being a source of revenue
for the Crown.
My own opinion is the
land ceased to be
exempt years back, the
servants being dependent
on the cash allowance
only.
Under this view the
Decree in the Suit
Frames of the Temple
of the Servants to
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Order

The lands are not Inam lands but ordinary Sirkar Cundayam lands. The question at issue ~~between the Temple & the Ryots whether the occ is occupancy~~ is whether the occupancy right is vested in the Temple or in the Cultivating Ryots — The Evidence appears to show that the occupancy right is with the Temple, & ~~that the Patta shd be in its name~~

2. The Temple through its managers has the right to Contest alienations & recover the alienated lands in due Course of law. On the other hands if the Ryots claim an occupancy right in the lands to the exclusion of the Temple they are at liberty to establish their claim by suit in the Civil Courts without such an adjudication no change will be allowed in the Patta which has stood in the joint names of the Temple & the Ryots since 1876/77 -

Ver. Pro ale reserved. 29/3/87

That the Ryots hold as tenants under the Temple, the rent being in the shape of Service rendered to the Temple - under this view of the case I am of opinion that the Patta shd stand in the Exclusive name of the Temple -

Read Petitions dated 21st Sept. 1885 & October 1886 from Munisyappa & others of Bannerghatta, Anekal Taluk, praying that the Joint pattahs of their lands issued in their names & in that of the temple of Sree Champaka Dhama Swami in that village may be ordered to be confined to their names, the name of the temple being excluded.

Read Bangalore Dy Comr's letters Nos. 963 & 783 dated respectively the 7th January 1886 & 18th January 1887 together with the Ver: papers received therewith

C. No. 2307 d 29/31. 3.87

Order thereon:—

The lands are not Inam lands but ordinary Sirkar Candayan lands. The question at issue is whether the occupancy right is vested in the temple or in the cultivating ryots. The evidence appears to show that the occupant

right is with the Temple, & that the ryots hold as quasi tenants under the Temple, the rent being in the shape of service renderable to the Temple. Under this view of the case, the Dewan is of opinion that the Patta should stand in the Exclusive name of the Temple.

2. The Temple, through its managers, has the right to contest alienations and recover the alienated lands in due course of law. On the other hand if the ryots claim an occupancy right to the lands to the exclusion of the temple they are at liberty to establish their claim by suit in the Civil Court Without such an application no change will be allowed in the

Patta

Patta which has stood
in the joint names of the
Temple & the Rajah since
1876-77.

Vernacular proceedings
are returned.

Chief Secretary

To

The Deputy Commr.
Bangalore &c

Dated to Petn.

(General Serial No. 31.)

1888 | 719

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated
Despatched 5th June
Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No.
D. No. 165. | 1888.89

With reference to p
the Dewan's Proceedi
No. 2307 dated 29th March
authorizing the temple o
Baneragatta in the Ak
Taluk, though its ma
to contest the right of
and recover lands held
to the temple and hal
the temple servants, I
the honor to forward
with Anikal Taluk a
Map No. 3 with its Index
from which it will be
that certain lands in
particularized in
Putty filed in the Dewan
Proceedings, formerly
by the Pattegar and

Govt Order No. 2039 dated 27-6-88

Send for orders
11/6

I don't think the
Govt have much
Claim of witnessing
[illegible]

I am of the opinion
Heads of the Advocate
for Opinion on the Dy
Commissioners
21/6 R.Y.

ter minor servants of the said temple have
n sold partly in the satisfaction of it
ents, and partly on account of arrears
kandayam. As these lands belong to the
mple and as Government is also the
Amildar proposes that the Government
ncade may be ordered to take up the
and contest the alienations without
na Expenditure to the Sircar. As regards
Costs the Amildar adds that this may
met from the amount now under
plus Funds, viz. Rs 64/4 and odd.

I would therefore solicit the favor
orders in the matter. I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
T Ramanuja
pro Dy Commissioner

(General Serial No. 30 R

188 .

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Government Advocate,

Dated 2nd July 88.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & 2 Papers

General No. 2039

No. 180

Has the honor to forward a copy of letter No. 165 dated 5th June 88 from the Dy. Comrs. Bangalore District together with the enclosures in the case of the lands belonging to the Bandar Ghatta Temple in the Anekal Taluk and to request to be furnished with his opinion on the Dy. Comrs recommendation thereon.

H. Lee

(General Serial No. 30.)

3907
2 Aug 90
635

1890.

From The Government Advocate in Mysore.

To The Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore.

Dated 29 July 90.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 31

No.

Sir,

With reference to your Letter No. 2039/180 dated 2d. July 1888 forwarding for opinion the papers relating to the alienation of Brunerphutta Temple lands, I have the honor to state that the Dy. Commissioner should have submitted a statement of the case with the necessary information to enable me to give my opinion in the matter - I therefore request you will be good enough to favor me with a statement of the case embodying the information now called for on the points noted in

References as 1/1880

Sir E. Ba

honor
Put up a draft order
Ltr to Dy. Commr. Mysore
Ltr to Govt. Advocate
Mysore
11/8/90

Drafts
AHK 11/8/90

31
6-8-90

the accompanying Memo.

2. The Canarese papers are herewith returned for reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant.

S. Kanagaratnam
Government Advocate

H.L.

Serial No. 30)

From

To The Dy Commr
Bangalore District

Dated 18th August 190-

Despatched W

Received

Enclosures No. 1 W/P

General No. 5445 — 5-446/562

No. 248

Upi No 165 Dt 5 June 1888

Forwards a memo: with original papers received from the Govt Advocate in Mysore in his letter No. 3107 2 July 190 and requests submission of a statement of the case embodying the information called for on the points noted in the memo:

By Order

No 5446/562

Copy to Govt Advocate

Hill --

to be returned with the statement.

Memo

A brief account of the dedication of the lands to the temple is required. ~~and~~ On what conditions they were given to the temple servants and why the Puttahs were made in their names.

Land No. 1 Parputtegar's land. It appears from Column No. 7 of the Tamarese Statement that the Puttah was in Parputtegar's name at the time of attachment and there is nothing to show how it came to be transferred in the name of the idol. The date of the last sale is also required.

Lands Nos. 2, 3 and. When were the Nos. 2 and 4 sold for arrears of Candayam and No. 3 by the Civil Court and in whose names the Puttahs stood on the dates of Sales.

S. Ramanayake Mdy

Govt. Advocate

(General Serial No. 29.)

1890.



From The Dy Commr Bangalore

To 11285/477

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 24th December/90.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 2 & file of 8

General No.

Dept No. 889

His No. 5445/248 dated 7th August/90.

In reply has the honor to forward herewith, a Memo explaining the several points raised therein

The remarks correspondence connected with the subject are submitted for reference and obliging return.

Dy Commissioner

C Venkatesh 1-1-91

Record 7-1-91

nding with Anekal Amildar's Urzi No 53 dated 12th Ultmo. together with its enclosures and also original papers received with the docket under refer

Memo.

A Sum of 430 Pagodas seem to have been originally fixed as "Tasdik for the Temple, and in lieu of Cash payment the marginally villages of which the assessment was equal to the Tasdik, were granted as Sur vamaneyem to the Temple. A portion of these lands were given to the Temple Servants on Kandayem, the remainder having been retained under "Batayee" With the amount of Kandayem thus Recovered and the Realizations from "Batayee" the Temple Servants were paid their fixed Salaries. The Cost of Processions &c. of the Temple were also defrayed therefrom. But during the Administration of Tippu Sultan the villages are said to have been brought under attachment, and latterly in the year Parabhava (1807-8) such of the lands as were in the enjoyment of the Temple servants in the said Survamaneyem villages were confirmed to them (the Temple Servants) on largely reduced assessments. The Temple Servants were required to perform the Temple Services

2. Kanpa Chaitanahalli
3. Karey appanahalli
4. Sunnappa hallu
5. Varadahalli
6. Chikkanahalli
Gadde.

half, one third and one fourth

in the name of the Idol, the enjoyment of the lands being continued to the original holders.

4. The Patta of the lands, which stood in the name of the Parpategar was transferred to that of the Idol on the 30th October 1876, evidently as they were attached in satisfaction of Civil Courts decree. The Court sale was, however, held on the 15-16-17-18-19-21-22 and 23rd May 1877 after the Patta was transferred in the name of the Idol. No. 1 Parpategar's Land

Lands No. 2 and 4 were sold for arrears of Kandayen on 18th August 1877 and 13th June 1876 respectively. Land No. 2 — G Muney & Land No. 4 Parvatee.

Land No. 3 was sold under Civil Court's decree, about the year 1872, the exact date not being known. The Pattas stood in the names of the Temple servants at the time of these sales. Land No. 3 Venkatrama.

5 Although from the above summary of the Records it is evident that the lands had not been entered

in the name Idol before the at-
tachment of some of them, and the
sale of the others, yet the object for
which they were granted originally
being clear and this was under-
stood and acted up to by the
Grantees for nearly a Century, the
Temple has every claim to enforce
its right of requiring the holders to
perform their duties. Persons not
capable of performing such duties
cannot be allowed to retain their
possession

Signed B. G. Trichinopoly
Dated 5th December 1890. Asst. Commr. Salem
Camp Kaglipoor

"Copy"

Dy. Commr. Salem

ww
27-12-10

on their part, enjoying the above
said lands and assessment, re-
ceiving also fixed salaries, averaging
between Rs. 1-2-10 and 7 pies. This state of things
exicted for the past nearly
one Century - - - - -

Monthly Payments.

Worshipper	—	"	— 7 — "
Parpatagar	—	1	— 2 — 10
Shenbogue	—	"	— 5 — 3
Parachariaka	—	"	— 7 — "
Choorunaké	—	"	— 2 — 1
Cookman	—	"	— 1 — 5
Devarnama	—	"	— 6 —
Acharapurasha	—	"	— 2 —
Goller	—	"	— 5 —
Kolkar	—	"	— 5 —
Flowerman	—	"	— 5 —
Sweeper	—	"	— 4 —
Mashalchee	—	"	— 2
Thatté (2 persons)	—	"	— 10 —
Drummer	—	"	— 4 —
Gumbarté	—	"	— 4 —
Nagasara	—	"	— 6 —
Brutee	—	"	— 4 —
Dolu	—	"	— 4 —
Dhavané	—	"	— 3 —
Washerman	—	"	— "
			7 — 2 —

2. The lands seem to have been granted to the Temple Servants for-
-dentty for performing their res-
-pective duties in connection with
the Temple. The trifling salaries

paid to them, were by no means sufficient and but for the grant of these lands on reduced Kandayems the services would not have been performed these many years. On the other hand if their services had no connection with the grant of the lands, there was no reason for showing any extraordinary concessions to them The Kandayem would not have been certainly reduced to one half, one third and one fourth, the ordinary rate according to the importance of their services. Further if this was not the mutual understanding, the lands would never have continued in the enjoyment of the Temple Servants, continuously for so long a period, and the Temple duties would never have been regularly conducted for the trifling fiscal Salaries, which can hardly be sufficient for a days maintenance.

3. As there seems to have been an attempt on the part of these temple Servants to alienate these holdings, the Pattas of these lands were made out on 30th October 187

(General Serial No. 30).

1891.

From

To The Govt Advoc in Mysore.

Dated 15

Despatched January 91

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & 2

General No. 11235
No. 1477

His No 31 dated 29th July 90 requesting to be furnished with a statement of the case relating to the alienation of the Bennéghatta tenl. lands in the Anek Talk.

To be obligingly returned.

With reference to the above has the honor to forward herewith in original, Memo giving the particulars of the case received in this office from the Dy Commr, Bangalore Dist with his

(General Series No 30)

No. 189

From The Govt. Advocate in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Mysore Department

Dated

Despatched 27th April 1892

Received

Enclosures No. 1 File

General No. 57
No.

Sir,

I beg to forward File of Papers relating to Bunnerghutt Temp Service Lands selected for Amtal Talug.

I have the honor Sir,

Your most obedt Servt

C. Nallamuthu

Govt Advocate

Referred as 27/4

To the Secretary Govt of Mysore 27.4.92

MUZARAYI

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892.

From

To The Government Advocate
Mysore.

Dated 31st July 1892.

Despatched Camp Mysore.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. Camp No 1 R
No.

His letter No 57 D/27th April 1892, returning a File of Papers relating to Bamerigatta Temple Service lands situated in the Anekal Taluk

---

With reference to the above observes that his opinion on the question involved in the case was not received with the File.

2 Requests that he will be good enough to furnish it at an early date.

3. The entire File relating to the subject is herewith returned &

&C

Ul

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI BRANCH DEWAN OF MYSORE

326
1892 53

From The Govt Advocate in Mysore.

To The Secretary to the Govt Muzarayi Departt

Dated 7th September 1892

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 File 7 Revenue papers & Correspdce

General No. / No.

Sir,

With reference to your Letter Comp No. 1 dated 31st July 1892 I am to state that under Notifn 2/3 of the Mysore Govt dated 17th November 1877 under the sanction of the Govt of India published at page 88 of the Mysore Revenue Manual a notice will have to be issued to the ryots in the terms there mentioned and that the

Revd ack 8/9/1892

To the Secretary 5998 22/3/92

the Lands may be Summarily resumed and restored to the Institution if it could be shewn that the Alienees had at the time of purchase notice that they were Indian Lands.

The entire file relating to the Subject is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
S Rawlinson
Jr Govt Advocate

ಪೈಸೂರು ಪುಸ್ತಾಂಕಗಳ ಮುಚಕಾಂಯಸ್ಸೂರಿಗೆ

ಅಂಚಿಂಕಿಂಚರ ವರದಿಯ ಪ್ರತಿ

ಸನ್ 1893ನೇಯ ಸಾಲಿನ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ 18ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೆ

ಸಚ್ಚಿದಾನಂದ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರವಾದ

ಇಷ್ಟೆಯ ಸಚ್ಚಿದಾನಂದ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಮಾರಾಟವು ಸುಮಾರು 54 ಅಂಕಿಗಳಷ್ಟು

ಇದೆ. ಅಂದರೆ ಕಂ 2 — 7 — 17-8-ಆ

ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ 65 — 3 — 96-4-ಆ

ಖರ್ಚಾಯ್ತು 2 — 19 — 13-12-ಆ

ಮಾರಿದ್ದು 59 — 29 — 117-8-ಆ

ಉಳಿದಿರುವ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ — 7-5-6

124-13-6

ಈ 1890-91 ಆಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ 91-92ನೇಯ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಗಳಿಗೆ

ಸೇರಿದ ಮೊಂಟು ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಲಭಿಸಿದ ಲಾಭವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುವ

ಕ್ಕೆ. ಚಂದ್ರಪ್ಪನವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಲೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಮಜಾ

ಪೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದ ಯಾವ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕರಿಗೂ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	6-6-[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	10-10
[illegible]	[illegible]	13-2-5
[illegible]	[illegible]	4-12-6
[illegible]	[illegible]	7-13-5
[illegible]	[illegible]	6-6-[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	4-12-6
[illegible]	[illegible]	5-13-6
[illegible]	[illegible]	4-12-6
[illegible]	[illegible]	60-4-8
	[illegible]	124-13-6

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಮಾಸ್ತಿ ವಿಜಯರಾಯರ ಮಗಳು ಸುಬ್ಬಮ್ಮ ಇವರು ಹುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು 1891ರಲ್ಲಿ. ಇವರ ಮದುವೆ ಆದದ್ದು 1907ರಲ್ಲಿ. ಆಗ ಇವರಿಗೆ 16 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸು. ಇವರ ಗಂಡ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ಯರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಅಕ್ಕನ ಮಗ. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಆಗ 21 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗಿಂತ 5 ವರ್ಷ ದೊಡ್ಡವರು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದ್ದು ಓದಿದರು. ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರು ಇವರನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗಿಂತ ಮೊದಲೇ ಕಾಲವಾದರು. ಇವರು ಕಾಲವಾದಾಗ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗೆ 76 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸು. ಆಗ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರು ಇವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಕವನ ಇದು.

ಸುಬ್ಬಮ್ಮ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಮೊದಲ ಮಗಳು. ಇವರು ಹುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು 1870-71ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಇವರ ಗಂಡ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ಯರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಅಕ್ಕನ ಮಗ. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗಿಂತ 5 ವರ್ಷ ದೊಡ್ಡವರು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದ್ದು ಓದಿದರು. ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರು ಇವರನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗಿಂತ ಮೊದಲೇ ಕಾಲವಾದರು. ಇವರು ಕಾಲವಾದಾಗ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗೆ 76 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸು. ಆಗ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರು ಇವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಕವನ ಇದು.

ಸುಬ್ಬಮ್ಮ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಮೊದಲ ಮಗಳು. ಇವರು ಹುಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು 1891ರಲ್ಲಿ. ಇವರ ಮದುವೆ ಆದದ್ದು 1907ರಲ್ಲಿ. ಆಗ ಇವರಿಗೆ 16 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸು. ಇವರ ಗಂಡ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ಯರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಅಕ್ಕನ ಮಗ. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಆಗ 21 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗಿಂತ 5 ವರ್ಷ ದೊಡ್ಡವರು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದ್ದು ಓದಿದರು. ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರು ಇವರನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇವರು ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗಿಂತ ಮೊದಲೇ ಕಾಲವಾದರು. ಇವರು ಕಾಲವಾದಾಗ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರಿಗೆ 76 ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸು. ಆಗ ಮಾಸ್ತಿಯವರು ಇವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಕವನ ಇದು.

२.

No. 599 Encl file

D/22/13/1913

To.

The Govt. Advocate
in Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 146 Dy 7th September 1892, intimating as your opinion that under Clause B of Govt. Notification No. 266 Dy 17th November 1877, a notice may be issued to the alienees to restore the lands assigned for service in the Channakeshavaswami temple at Bamerighatta, Anekal Taluk and that, if they fail to do so, the lands may be summarily resumed and restored to the Institution, I am directed to state that the rules laid down

in the said Notification
are applicable ~~to~~ only to the
Inam lands attached to
the religious and Charitable
Institutions, but the lands
now in question are ordinary
Sirkar Kandayam lands
registered jointly in the
names of the temple and
its servants as observed by the Dewan in
~~Vide, Decree~~
Order Camp No 2307 dt
28th March 1887 and that
some of these lands have
been sold for arrears of
land revenue and others
in execution of the decrees
obtained in Civil Courts
against the temple servants
and the purchasers are now
in possession of the lands.
These sales have taken
place more than 15 years
ago.

2. I am now to enquire whether suits can be filed against the alienees on behalf of the temple for the recovery of these alienated lands.

3. The entire file is herewith forwarded for reference and obliging return.

4. A very early reply is requested.

I have &c.

Sd/-

Secretary

to Govt.

(General Serial No. 30.)



189

From The Government Advocate in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated Mugrai Department

Despatched 15th April 1893

Received 18th "

Enclosures No. 1 File.

General No. 59
No.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 599 dated 22 Ultimo, I have the honor to state that from the file of papers, it appears that there are 4 Holdings, Nos 1-2-3 & 4 which had been sold: two of which (Nos 2 & 4) for arrears of Tondogem and the others (Nos 1 & 3) under Civil Court decrees. As regards Nos 2 & 4 I am of opinion that no action can be taken

to

* Enclosures returned herewith.

D.6 Bangalore 695 7 20/4/93

to recover them. The question now remains as regards No. 1 & 3. Though there is a general assertion that these lands had been lightly and favourably assessed in favor of the Temple Servants as part remuneration of this Temple duties I cannot find any documentary evidence to shew such a Concession - In the absence of such a Concession & assuming that lands had been fully assessed, no special obligation could thereby be created against the holders of the lands to render any service to the Temple, though they might happen to be Temple Servants.

From pa. 19 of the Memo prepared in the Revenue Office it appears that the Settlement of these Villages was then in progress. Before finally giving my opinion I should look to know whether these references to in this correspondence were ably assessed, & whether any cases to the usual prevailing rates on which lands were imposed upon them.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

Recommended
Lieutenant Governor

MUZARAI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893.

From

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

To

The Dy Comr
Bangalore Distt

Dated 29th

Despatched 20 April

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & Title

General No. 695
Muzarai F. No.

Adverting to his no 669 dated 24th Decr/90 in connection with the alienation of the Bamuri ghatta temple lands in the Anekal Taluq, has the honor to forward herewith copy of letter no 59 of the 15th inst from the Govt Advocate desiring information as to how the lands in question were assessed during the

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore—10-1-92

in the Same Lrs 1071 & 27 2-94

Survey Settlement and
to request that this in
formation will be sub
mitted to this office
at an early date.

2. The file of
vernacular papers
is herewith returned
for reference and
resubmission.

By orde

Secreta

(General Serial No. 39.)

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI BRANCH 600 1893/94 DEWAN OF MYSORE

From

The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore
Muzrai Department

Dated 27th Feby/94.

Despatched 3rd March/94.

Received 3. 3. 94

Enclosures No. 2 & 6 Sle

General No.

D No. 1011.

Advert on 3/3/1894

With reference to his No 695 dated 24th April last, calling for particulars as to how the Banneergatta Isle land in the Sheik Ishalak are assessed.—

— " —

Referring to the above, has the honor to forward a statement shewing how these lands were assessed during the Survey—

2. The Vernacular

To Govt. advocate No 1133 & 26/Feby
93-93

records are re-submitted for reference.

In Remarks
for Commissioners

MUZARAI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894

From

The Secy

To

The Govt Advocate,
Bangalore.

Dated 26

Despatched 27 April 1894

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No. 1133

Muzarai F. No. 98 98

~~With reference~~

His no 599 of the 15th April 1893 on the alienation of certain ~~lan~~ inam land attached to the Bennargatta Temple

With reference to the last para of the above, has the honor to forward herewith

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore—26-9-93-1,000

the Statement ~~Received~~
received from the
Bangalore ~~X~~ Dewan & Steering
the particulars of the
Survey assessment
on the Inam lands
in question.

2. ~~Accounts~~.
The Vernacular
papers connected
with the case are
herewith forwarded
for reference and
obliging return.

would she have been invited??

By order
[illegible]

Dy Secretary
Army 26/4
[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE
99
MUZARAI
BRANCH
DEWAN OF MYSORE

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From The Assistant Government Advocate in Mysore

To

Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Muzarai Department.

Dated 20th August 1894

Despatched 22nd do

Received 22-8-94

Enclosures No. 1 & 1 File

General No. 41
No.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1133, dated 26th April 1894, 93-93 I am of opinion that no action can be taken to recover any of the items of the lands under reference as the Statement sent with the letter under reply clearly shows that these lands have been fully assessed at

Ref of

Submitted
26.8.94

Under the circumstances no action is now required by

To the Secretary 494-5 of 30/1894
93-94

at the Survey Settlement and besides Items Lands Nos 2 & 4 have been so for the arrears of Kundayem.

2. The file of papers is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt Servt

S Rossmanner
Asstt Govt Advocate

Read

~~Letter~~ Correspondence ending
with Docket no 10 11
92, from the Dy
Land. Bungalow Sh
regg. the alienation
of certain lands held
by the Sri Ramanatha
-dhamaswami Temple
in Bommasatte, ~~Coorkal~~
Arekal Taluk

And

Letter no. 41 dy. -

Aug 18 from the Govt. advocate
~~reporting~~ his opinion
on the above.

Order thereon

The lands under
consideration are not Inam
lands but ordinary
Kandayam

MUZARAI.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

Muzarai F. No.

and the occupancy right which rested with the Temple, the patta being registered in the former's name, the Temple and its servants - some of these lands have been sold in execution of Civil Court decrees passed against the Temple servants in possession thereof, while the others have been sold for arrears of Kandayam. ~ the alienations sale having taken place between the years 1872 & 1877.

2. The Dy. Com^r. has proposed that the Put- as manager of the Temple might thro' the Put- advocate institute a civil suit to contest the alienations and recover the lands for the temple in due course of law. But the put-advocate

when the question referred for

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—26-9-93-1,00